

The occupation

16. Hee that loueth not thee,
what doth he loue?

17. He that admireth not thee,
what doth he admire?

I will loue my selfe, not because
I am mine, but because I am thine;
I will haue care of my selfe, not
for any other reason, but because
thou so willest and commaundest.

I esteeme my selfe more happy
in thy happines, then I count my
selfe wretched for my owne misfe-
rie. And the contentment I take
that thou art that, which thou art,
farre exceedeth the discontent-
ment I feele by being that which
I am. Be thou then, my God, for
euer that, which thou art, & make
me other then I am, That is, wher-
as I am my selfe miserable, I shall
be in thee blessed and happy.

To thee, in thee, by thee, & for
thee, O my God, be all things.

Amen.

The occupation

16. Hee that loueth not thee,
what doth he loue?

17. He that admireth not thee,
what doth he admire?

I will loue my selfe, not because
I am mine, but because I am thine;
I will haue care of my selfe, not
for any other reason, but because
thou so willest and commaundest.

I esteeme my selfe more happy
in thy happines, then I count my
selfe wretched for my owne mis-
erie. And the contentment I take
that thou art that, which thou art,
farre exceedeth the discontent-
ment I feele by being that which
I am. Be thou then, my God, for
euer that, which thou art, & make
me other then I am, That is, wher-
as I am my selfe miserable, I shall
be in thee blessed and happy.

To thee, in thee, by thee, & for
thee, O my God, be all things.

Amen.

M. LE HVCHER
MINISTER
OF AMYENS IN

FRANCE COMPELLED
 to fly from the pure word of Holy
 write; stricke dumme; and made
 to runne away.

*Vppon the subiect of the B. Sacrament
 of the Altar.*

By F. FRANCIS VERON of the
 Society of IESVS, encountring
 him with the Bible of
 Geneua only.

In the presence of the Duke de Longuenille.

With a brieffe and easie meanes, by which
 each Catholicke may, in like manner, put
 to flight any Minister or Sectarie.

*Sent from Sieur de la Tour one of the sayd
 Dukes Gentlemen, to Sieur de Rotois,
 Gentleman of the Kings game.*

Printed

TO BE REPRODUCED WITHOUT SPECIFIC PERMISSION

Explication of the Title.

This Conference was held three severall times. In the first the Father of the Society; compelled the Minister to abandone the pure word of the holie scripture; In the 2. he putt him to silence; In the 3. he made him runne away.

Testimony of the said conference.

It is signed by the Father of the Society; by the Duke of Longueuilles Gentlemen who accompanying theyr Lord were present therat; and in parte by the Minister, which refused to subscribe to that, which putt him most to confusion. The subscriptions follow in theyr proper place.



the tre
breui
the ea
confus
well t
hath
men b
concern
that, v
ordina
capacit
affection
of most
malicious
versly ob
the wil



To the Reader.



Two things there are (good Reader) which made me (desirous of thy eternall good) to turne for thy vse this little treatise into our language. The one the breuity and pleasure it yealdeth, the other the easines and perspicuity, with which it confuteth, it instructeth. The first suteth well to that lazy humour, which heresy hath brought into our country, whereby men haue little gust to read ought, that concernes their soules, and scarce ought of that, vnles it be well seasoned with extraordinary delight. The other (supposing thy capacity, and affection to truth, which if affection misleade me not, is equall to that of most Nations, and by heresy I hope not maliciously peruerbed, or at least not perversely obstinate therein) makes me presume thou wilt easily see, and quickly leaue that

blind mans maZe, of the falsly pure pre-
tended word, wherin thou hast bene long
ledde round. Both of ibem, by Gods as-
stance, promisse vnto me no little fruite of
this small worke, which is that I hartely
desyre for thy soules good, and Gods grea-
ter glory. Farewell.

Thy welwiller in
IESVS CHRIST.
D. V.



pose
tent
feren
of m
uille
ques
Bour
tholik



A LETTER OF
M^r. DE LA TOVR
GENTLEMAN TO THE
DUKE OF LONGVEVILLE.

Written unto M^r. de Ratois Gentleman of the Kings game.



Y^r the ardent zeale I know you haue of the good and glory of our Religion, makes me suppose you wil receaue a singular content in the relation of a priuate conference, had of late in the presence of my Lord the Duke of Longueuille and his followers, of the Marques de Boniuer, of the Lady de Bourcq & diuers others as well Catholiks as Sectaries, between Father

Francis Veron of the Society of Ie-
 sus, preacher for this present in the
 great Church of this Citty, & M. le
 Hucher minister of the Caluinists in
 the same place, touching that point
 of our Faith, of the body of the sone
 of God in the Sacrament of the Al-
 tar. The said Father agreeing to deale
 with that Minister by the Bible of
 Geneua only, and the Confession of
 faith of the reformed. This confe-
 rence hath had three sessions, at the
 first I was not present, not being ad-
 uertised of the same. Notwithstanding
 at the beginning of the second,
 the actes of the former session were
 read, allowed & auowed by both par-
 ties as authentically. Wherefore I will
 make recitall of that which passed in
 the sight of my Lord, & vs that were
 attending on him, besides a great
 multitude of diuerse of the one, and
 the other Religion. The said Father
 on the morrow after the last confe-
 rence which was Sunday, made an
 ample narration of the three passed

me
 pe
 ou
 mo
 af
 cal
 test
 mo
 uin
 31. a
 of
 wor
 that
 of
 was
 and
 seco
 of
 ming
 neua
 cofe
 text
 Gene
 side
 errou

meetings to aboue eight thousand
persones, assembled in the Church of
our Lady to heare his sermon. The
most heerof is signed as you will see
after, wherfore no man can iustlie
call in question a matter so cleerly
testified.

Our Deuine atchieued three fa-
mous victories. For the Minister ha-
uing promised conformably to the
31. and 5. articles of theyr Confession
of their faith, to shew by the pure
word of the Bible, that we erred in
that beleefe we haue, that the body
of our Lord is in the Eucharist, he
was constrained in the first session
and againe in the entrance vnto the
second trial, to fly from his fortresse
of the pure word, of force disclai-
ming from the pure scripture of Ge-
neua: and withall acknowledged and
cōfessed, that there was no expresse
text in all the scripture, euen by the
Geneua translation, which, letting a
side all illations, did condemne vs of
errour. But (quoth the Minister) by

necessary consequence out of the pure worde of God I will make it cleare that you do erre.

The night comming on made our combatant cease the pursuite, & not driue him farther, who already sheltered himself within the ruinous edifice of a Consequence. The Father told me, that it was not of small importance, to make the Sectaries clearly see & confesse, that they haue not for themselves the pure scripture, but only certain consequences, for (quoth he) the cause that makes so many to beginne, and continue in their reuolt from Gods Church, is for that they perswade themselves, that they haue on their sides the pure word of God; for so saith the 5. article of their Confession, that they admitt nothing for the rule of faith, but the pure word: & they do veryly suppose that that Confession containeth nothing, but that which is in the pure worde. After the approbation of that passed before, the

Mi
adm
con
den
fro
vag
Fat
all
him
nall
say
ny
all
larg
wo
crea
wh
the
Ido
had
this
mu
the
the
gue
thu

Minister at the second session was admitted to deduce his necessary consequence, by which he would demonstrate how farre we wandered from the truth. He first fetched long vagaries round about, afterward the Father so dexterously put him beside all his proofes, & in brieft brought him to such pangues, that for the finall proposition he had nothing to say against the Father, but, ô you deny to much; after which he became altogether speechles, as I wil more largely declare hereafter. Certes you would haue been extraordinarily recreated to behold, how he that erewhile made profession to proue by the pure word of God that we were Idolaters, in lieu of the pure word, had not a word to help himself, saue this only, that the Iesuite denied to much. wee I am sure had good sport therein. Ours which had thus chased the minister, still put him to these pangues for a long time still vrging him thus. M. Minister prooue your con-

sequence. Neither did he omitt to signifie plainly and alowde to the whole assemblie, to what exigents the poore Minister was brought to, who sustained the Confession of the faith of the reformed Religion, and bragged to discover by the pure word our errours. Had not the quality of the Ministers cause been such as it was, I should haue had compassion to haue seen him in that plight, and so oppressed. He desired they would giue him that night for respite, and to thinke vppon it; but the Father denied him; he alleaged he was suddainly surprised, the other replied that he had had all the night, and morning before for his prooffe of that consequence. It was not neede to take pittie of the Minister, for his fellow Sectaries had sufficient cōmiseration of him; all of them round about me beganne to change colour, the Elders and Superintendents stood as it were astonished, & cōfounded. You may coniecture ea-

sily
or n
nist
him
not
The
quis
this
con
tab
sub
con
for
ter
vain
den
ster
mis
bes
not
ma
I k
vpp
wil
(yo
his

sily whether we were ioyfull thereat
or no. Alas (said one) the poore Mi-
nister wants a Chirurgian to open
him a vayne. This victory was more
notorious by this which followeth.
The conquerour exacted of the van-
quished to subscribe to the Acts of
this conference, according to the ac-
cord made between them. A lamen-
table case! that the ouercome must
subscribe to the actes of his owne
condemnation. He refused to per-
forme his promisse. The Father af-
ter many instant vrgings of him in
vaine, turned towards my Lord, and
demaunded iustice; that the Mini-
ster signe according as he had pro-
mised. The Minister desired fauour,
beseeching him often that he would
not cōmaund him to subscribe, after
many prayers adding these wordes.
I know how much it stands me
vppon not to signe, for if I do so, all
will be published: and the Churches
(you vnderstand his meaning at least
his lamenting voice discovered his

intention) the poore congregations (he should say) of the pure reformation will be scandalized therat. The Father hauing before desired one of ours to shutt the doore, least the minister should runne away, bid him consult with his Elders, and Superintendents, whether it were expedient to signe the actes or no: for which cause drawing them apart it was resolved that he should not signe them. I will send you shortly more at large this debate, which lasted three quarters of an howre. In fine, with the consent of the Father, they graunted him this fauour that he should not subscribe, but with these two conditions: the first that he should subscribe the morrow after; the second that he should continew the dispute. By this refusal to subscribe vnto the Actes, it is apparent how notable the victorie was on our parte.

In the third encounter our Champion gott a third victory, but in an

othe
The
He
a ga
thou
the l
It w
tend
to v
befo
ly, f
like
detr
Y
pres
this
the
fore
ner
be r
cha
fash
and
etif
seaz
assu

other kind; will you knowe what? The minister shamefully rann away. He was not willing to be laid againe a gasping as before, and therefore thought it better not to inter into the listes, as I will declare afterward. It was giuen out that the Superintendentes had expresse forbidd him to venture himselfe with him, who before had vsed him so vnmercifully, for they well saw the confusion like to follow therof, to the great detriment of their Churches.

Your Religious minde makes me presume you take great delight in this chace; I will therefore giue you the whole narration. But yett before hand I wil shew you a new manner of hunting, which, though you be most skilfull in that sport, is perchance vknowne vnto you. The fashion is speedy, with little paines, and most effectuell, by which practise our Huntsman hath so happily seized on his pray: and by the same I assure my self. that euen we whose

profession is to be better at our wea-
 pon then our penne, may chace out
 of breath any Minister soener, and
 make any Sectarie see how grosselie
 he is abused. This I haue compiled
 as a thing I knowe to be true, and
 wherof I meane to serue my self on
 all occasions. In this Conference I
 haue had experience of this practise,
 for therein was held no other me-
 thode; & to satisfy your desire, who
 I knowe are curious to learne this
 new manner of hunting, you may
 read this which followeth, the like
 wherof was sent vnto the Minister
 as a letter of defiance. Read it seri-
 ously. To me it seemes most efficaci-
 ous and as easy. Wee shall all prooue
 hunters of these black beastes, the
 Ministers I meane of the pretended
 Religion. I would to God we could
 so chace away not their persons, but
 their errours, that we could purge all
 France thereof. This I now send you
 laid downe at large, you shall short-
 ly haue the particulars of the confe-

re
yo

co

u

J

6

7

4

4

7



Y
Cōf

In o

Chur

after

rence aboue mentioned, in which
you will see it practised.



A BREEFE AND EASIE

*meanes by which each one though
ignorant of deuinity, may by the
sole Bible either of Geneva, or any
other; shew apperently to any Mi-
nister how farre he is deceaued,
and to each Calvinist, how in all
and euery point of the pretended
reformation he is abused.*



NCOUNTING a
Minister or anie o-
ther Calvinist, you
shall proceed in this
manner.

You haue in the 31. article of the
Cōfession of your faith these words.
*In our dayes, in which the estate of the
Church was dissolued, God hath raised men
after an extraordinary manner to repaire*

of new the Church which was ruinated and desolate. Thus, you say, your Religion comes to reforme our errours.

In the 5. article are these words. The word which is containd in these bookes (he spake of the bookes of Holy Scripture) is the rule of all truth, containing all that is necessary for the service of God, and our saluation; Neither is it lawfull for men, no nor for Angells, to adde, diminish, or change. VVhence it followeth that neither Antiquitie, nor Customes, nor Multitude, nor humane Wisdome nor Definitions, nor Inhibitions, nor Proclamations, nor Decrees, nor Councils, nor Revelations, nor Miracles may be opposed to the said holy Scriptures, but on the contrarie all thinges ar to be examined, ruled, and reformed by them. These are the wordes of this article.

So that in the one and the other article mentioned together, you say that you, or your Religion, or your Ministers (take your choise) are raised and sent from God, to illuminate vs with the light of truth, & to shew

vs
and
the
con
thru
me
sion
my
bod
of R
Cust
hau
gou
he w
purp
shew
ding
you
form
cted
refo
woul
2.
what
straig

vs our errours and that by the sole,
and pure word of God contained in
the holy Scripture.

1. First I might examine the
conditions of these Reformers you
thrust vpon vs. And vntill you shew
me your letter patents and commis-
sion, I may iustly refuse to submit
my self to be reformed by you. What
body poliricque will allow the title
of Reformour of their Lawes, and
Customes (according to which they
haue hitherto proceeded in their
gouernment) in one who should say
he was sent from the King for that
purpose, but had no Commission to
shew for the same? Notwithstan-
ding in currelty I do freely admitt
you to the dignity and title of a Re-
former, & am content to be instru-
cted by you in the truth, and to be
reformed in whatsoeuer I do erre. I
would know of you.

2. According to what rules, by
what line doth it please you to
straighten me, to shew my errours,

and illuminate me with the truth of the Gospell? You make me answere in the 5. article aboue cited, that you will do all this according to the pure word of God, sett downe in Holie writt, laying aside, *All Antiquity, Customs, Multitude, humane VVisdome, Definitions, Inhibitions, Proclamations, Lawes, Councels, Reuelations, Miracles.* I could refuse this fashion of reforming. For why should I not, together with the Scripture, help my self with all other rules to discerne the truth thereby? Especially since that the Scripture no where saith, that it self alone is the rule of all verity. It seemes hard to me to renoūce al Antiquity, Coucels, Miracles, & all the rest before sett downe. Neuertheles to ioyne with you in Conference, I am content of my owne accord to graunt you the title of Reformer by the pure written word, & am ready to renounce al those rules specified, provided allwaies that you keepe your promise, to witt that you shew

me
ture
3.
of
you
Per
neu
form
curr
and
form
uon
and
shew
ned
truth
allso
thre
the r
form
to m
of th
you l
pure
shift
ons,

me my errours, by the pure Scripture.

3. There are diuers translations of the Scriptures; by which, I pray you, will you please to reforme me? Perchance you intēd by that of Geneva. I might iustly refuse to be reformed by that Bible; being it is so curtalled in diuers places, corrupted, and changed: Yet to haue your reformation I wil do you this third fauour. I am content to open my eyes and follow your Religion, if you shew my by the pure word contained in the Geneva version, both the truth of the faith you Euangelize, & also my errours. I haue donne you three great fauours. 1. to graunt you the title of a Reformer. 2. to be a Reformer by the pure word. The third to make this triall by the pure word of the Geneva version. But looke you bring me nothing els but the pure word; for if in steede of it you shift me of with your interpretati-
ons, you forsake the Confession of

your faith, & breake the couenants made betweene vs. For I am not so vnaduised to renounce all Antiquity, Councells, Miracles and the rest, for your interpretations and opinions.

Agreeably to this, to your owne promise, & that which is sett downe in your 5. article, I demaund two things at your hands. First that you shew me by the pure word the truth of all those articles which you will haue me to beleue: which I am ready to do, if I see them in the Bible euen of Geneva. Secondly that by the same pure word you shew me my errours. Both of these I demand, for both of these you professe to do when as you say, that *the Scripture is the rule of all truth*, and you acknowledge no other. For put the case I should erre in my faith, I would be loth to leaue that, to follow a worse. No wise man, I take it, though his horse haue but one eye wil make exchange for another that is blind; I de-

fire
the
refu
min
be p
is, t
wor
sio,
and
In
that
ordi
the b
the p
the
the
as m
faith
a fig
spea
this,
abiu
you
you
In
nall

fire therfore to see by the pure word
the truth of yours. Which you cānot
refuse to do, for you are sent to illu-
minate vs, & shew vs the truth. To
be plaine therfore, my first demaund
is, that you shew me by the pure
word the Articles of your Confes-
sion, by which I must be illuminated,
and made to knowe the right way.

In the 36. and 37. article you say
that *we receaue by faith*, or, to vse your
ordinary termes, *by the mouth of faith*
the body of our Lord. Shew me this in
the pure word, & that the supper is
the figure of his body. Through all
the Geneva Bible I find not so much
as mention made of the mouth of
faith, neither do I finde any talke of
a figure in those places, where it
speakes of the supper. Shew me but
this, & I will straight beleue it and
abiure my former Religion. This if
you do not, I must needs hold you, as
you ar, for impostours.

In the 11. article it is said. *Origi-
nall sinne doth continually remaine after*

Baptisme in as much as it is a fault, howbeit
the children of God are freed from the
cōdemnation due for the same, he through
his gracious goodnes not imputing it vnto
them. Shew me this in the pure word
of Geneva.

In the 24. article. Iesus Christ is
giuen vs for our sole Aduocate, The strife
between vs is about that worde sole,
shew me that in the Geneva Bible.

In the 20. article. We belecue we
are made partakers of that iustice (to
witt of Christians) by faith alone. All
the controuerfielyeth in that word
alone, and whether workes donne in
the faith of Christ be necessary; shew
me that worde alone in these places,
where mention is made of workes
donne in the faith of IESVS CHRIST,
and not in these places, where the
Iudaicall workes of the law are ex-
cluded from Christian iustification,
for of these only do we dispute. I
haue turned the Bible for the places
cited in the margent for these arti-
cles, but cannot find any of these ar-

articles
H
shew
you
me a
maur
articl
Th
ampl
Sacre
there
surv
know
of Re
your
Saints
and so
the lik
point
In yo
whic
haue
swear
of er
are no
becau

articles in the pure word.

Having quitt your hands well, in shewing me the truth of that which you desire I should beleue, shew me as well that other thing I demaunde, to witt the errours of those articles which I now beleue.

The articles of my faith are for example (to omitt that point of the B. Sacrement already spoken of) *That there is a Purgatory, Intercession of Saints, Auricular Confession, and the like. I acknowledge the sanctity of Pilgrimages, of Religious Vowes.* Against which in your 24. article you say. *Intercession of Saints is an abuse, Purgatorie an illusion and so of religious vowes, Pilgrimages and the like.* Shew me my errour in these points, & that out of the pure word. In your margent I find no text cited, which is a shrewd suspiciō that you haue none. Perchance you wil answer that it sufficeth for a prooffe of errour in these points, that they are not found in the holy scripture, because nothing must be beleued

but that which is in the scripture. My reply to this is to know of you whether this proposition. *That nothing must be beleued which is not in the holy scripture* be found in the pure word of God or. If it be not, then you M. Minister in propounding this proposition to be beleued of me, do falsify your owne sayth, and breake your promise; for you sayd you wold not admitt any other rule of truth but the scripture, which is in effect, that you will bring forth nothing but that which is in scripture, and now you thrust vpon me this proposition, which is not there to be found, & this as a fundamental proposition vpon which ar builded many others: but if this proposition be in the pure word, shew it; but take heede you bring nothing, but the pure word.

When by the pure word you shall shew me the truth of your articles, and the falshood of mine, as hath been said before, I am ready forth-

wit
to e
ber
you
the
rou
quit
ons
mes
in st
shif
ons
eith
Scri
fort
Scri
you
derst
gane
wile
forg
of w
ter in
you
be ef
forfa

with to acknowledge my errour, & to embrace your faith. But remember, I pray you, your promise, that you would by the pure word shew the truth of your faith and my errors; and that I renounced all antiquity, Councels, Miracles, Inhibitions, Lawes, visions vppon these termes only, and no other. Look that in steed of the pure word, you do not shift me of with your interpretations or your owne consequences, for either that interpretation is in the Scripture, or no; if it be there, bring forth the Scripture: and that the Scripture saie of each proposition you interpret, that it is so to be vnderstood, & that you only are the organ to pronounce the same, otherwise you leaue your owne faith, and forge an other to your owne liking, of which I shall argue with you after in the like sorte; & besides that you breake your promise. I should be esteemed of small iudgment if I forsake Councells, Miracles, An-
72

quity and the rest for your interpretation.

If the Minister pretend to warrant his interpretation by some other passage of the Scripture, for example if he urge that those words (*This is my body*) must not be taken properlie but figuratiuelie, because these others (*I am a Vine*) haue such a signification: You shall aske him.

1. Before you passe to any interpretation, if he haue any plaine text, which abstracting from all interpretation doth condemne vs of error: for example in that point of the E. Sacrament, in which we beleene there is the true body of our Saviour. If he haue any, lett him bring that which is cleare and plaine, and leaue that which is obscure: if he haue none, make him to confesse distinctly, that he hath no place out of the pure word, by which, without his interpretation, he can conuince vs of error; and heere you must in-

sist
fess
com
giue
2.
say t
are n
a Vin
shew
niste
not f
ture
in litt
out r
which
thing
ture, p
needf
farther
heere
stocks
better
traunc
ther. Y
story, &
the Cal

sist on this point, till he haue confessed this. After this Confession comming to the interpretation he giues, you shall.

2. Demaunde, if the Scripture say that these words (*This is my Body*) are to be interpreted by these (*I am a Vine*) or no. If it say so, lett him shew the place; If not, then the Minister breaks his couenants, & doth not serue as an organe of the Scripture only. And heere the Minister is in little ease, neither can he, without renouncing their Confession, which professeth to allow of nothing to rule them, but pure Scripture, passe any farther. Neither is it needfull to pursue the matter anie farther, this being concluded, for heere haue you the Minister in the stocks; and perchance it will be better to keepe the Ministre in this traunce speechles, then to passe farther. Yet if you desire an other victory, & that he, which encountreth the Calvinist, be learned or expert

in the Scripture, he may, after the confession of the two former.

3. Harken to the interpretation the Ministre brings, and aunswere these proofes he alleageth for that interpretation. But allwaies remember that the Calvinist, by their Confession of faith, is come to instruct vs, & consequently bound to prooue his interpretation; for vs, if it conuince not, it sufficeth to deny, without obligation to giue any reasons for our deniall: for by those the Minister will finde meanes to slippe away, and will not be so quicklie caught: he will seek many by-waies, therfore as much as may be stoppe his passage. Behold how you are to proceede, when the Minister vnder-takes to shew our pretended errorre by text of Scripture, without consequences or illations.

When he will discouer our errorre by some consequence, which he deduceth out of the pure word of God for example, we beleuee that the body

of o
Al
que
sole
afte
A&C
teine
wor
Beh
is in
Iesus
on th
men
com
must
any
sequ
rou
lett h
to re
he ha
he ha
confe
uinced
stay, a
Mini

of our Lord is in the B. Sacrament of the Altar: he will prooue by consequence deduced out of the pure and sole Scripture, that he is not there, after this manner. In the 3. of the Actes, it is said, that *Heauen must con- teine him vntill the Consummation of the world*, therefore he is not on the earth. Behold his sillogisme. *That body which is in heauen is not on the earth, the body of Iesus Christ is in heauen, therefore it is not on the earth.* He must put his argument in this forme. 1. Before you come to aunswere his argument, you must aske the Minister if he haue any plaine text, which without consequence doth condemne vs of error in this point, or no? If he haue, lett him bring it out, who professeth to reforme vs by the pure word; If he haue not, make him confesse that he hath no plaine text, by which (his consequence lett a part) we are con- uinced of error; & heere you must stay, and exact this confession of the Minister before you passe farther.

Having made the Minister acknowledge this, though you may content your self with this victory (whereby you make him renounce the 5. article of their Confession of faith, and haue ouerthrowen that pillar which detaines most of the Sectaries, who follow that part in their errours; who imagine they haue on their side the pure word of God, and that they builde vpon the Scripture only) and peraduenture it wil be better to proceed no farther, to the end to make it eccho oftener in the eares of these who are abused by them: Neuerthelesse he that will continew the chace, and hauing rowzed the deere from his lodge pursue him farther.

2. Giuing the Minister leaue to deduce his consequence, after the deduction thereof, the Catholicque must not straight examine the truth of the same, nor shew so quickly that it is false; but first lay hold on him, and make him shew, that his consequence is deduced out of the only

pur
pro
his
mu
shic
kno
que
out
one
Min
be
pen
of
you
nife
aban
and
shew
cōse
and
the
That
earth
therf
exam
first

pure word of holy Scripture, as he
promissed to deduce the same, and
his 5. article doth oblige him. You
must therefore proceede in this fa-
shion. It is a thing vndoubted, and
known to all, that euery conse-
quence, to be good, must be inferred
out of two propositions; If then
one of those two, out of which the
Minister deduceth his consequence,
be not in the Scripture, (as it hap-
peneth ordinarily in the arguments
of the aduersary against vs) heere
you must demurr, and make it ma-
nifest, that the aduersarie heere
abandonnes his Confession of fayth,
and fayles of his promise, in not
shewing our pretended error by
cōsequence deduced out of the pure
and only Scripture. For example, in
the syllogisme before sett downe.
*That body which is in heauen is not on the
earth, the body of Iesus Christ is in heauen,
therefore it is not on the earth:* you shall
examine the Minister, whether the
first proposition of this argument be

in the pure word, or no. If it be, let
 him shew it. Cleere it is, it is not
 there, but it is a philosophicall pro-
 position, wherfore the Minister,
 which deduceth his consequence
 out of that, and the second adioy-
 ned, which is in the 3. of the Actes,
 doth not proue my errour by con-
 sequence deduced out of the pure
 word, but by consequence deduced
 out of Philosophy, and out of the
 word of God, and maketh such ar-
 ticles of faith, as are deduced out of
 Philosophy or Aristotle. 2. You must
 declare, that euery consequence
 must be deduced out of two propo-
 sitions, placed in the true forme of
 a syllogisme, and that the conse-
 quence is inferred both from the
 propositions, and from the forme
 of the syllogisme; of which forme
 the Scripture speakes nothing, nor
 prescribes any rules about that mat-
 ter, but only Aristotle, and Philoso-
 phy. Wherfore the Minister in proo-
 uing his consequence, is not foun-

ded
 trea
 ces.
 stor
 beg
 vpo
 his
 our
 but
 for
 Go
 mu
 Scr
 bel
 onl
 but
 cor
 or
 the
 he
 bib
 do
 of
 is n
 por
 of s

ded vpon the Scripture alone, which
 treats not of formes of consequen-
 ces. And because it belongs to Ari-
 stotle, to iudge if the consequence
 be good or no, the Minister building
 vpon consequence, must admitt for
 his iudge, in the controuersies of
 our fayth, not the pure Scripture,
 but Aristotle: or els at least choose
 for vmpyre in this cause the word of
 God, together with Aristotle. 3. You
 must demandaund of the minister, if the
 Scripture do teach that one must
 belecue as an article of faith, not
 only that which the Scripture saith,
 but also that, which by necessary
 consequence followeth therevpon,
 or no? if he say so, make him shew
 the text, which without doubt
 he cannot throughout the whole
 bible: if no such be founde, then
 doth the Minister build his articles
 of fayth vpon a proposition, which
 is not in the pure word, to witt v-
 pon this. *That that which followeth out
 of Scripture by necessary consequence, must*

be beleued as an article of faith. How-
 beit the Scripture frames no such
 article, but the Minister only, and
 that not by the pure Scripture, but
 by humane reason : from which
 notwithstanding in his 5. Article he
 disclaimed wholly. For he wold haue
 vs take at his handes for an article
 of faith that proposition, which by
 consequence followeth out of the
 Scripture, though the termes of
 that proposition, deduced out of
 Scripture for an article of sayth, be
 not there sett downe. Hence is it
 that all the articles of the Confes-
 sion of these sectaries, which are
 founded vpon a consequence, are
 not articles of sayth, being that they
 haue not for them theyr only rule
 of truth, the sole Scripture. Heere
 againe you must hold him. They
 will say perauenture that IESVS
 Christ, and the Apostles proued ma-
 ny thinges by consequence. I graunt
 it. But in so doing, they themselues
 made new Scriptures, or holy write:

wh
 nist
 tau
 the
 sole
 spal
 Scr
 fess
 thin
 wo
 3.
 nist
 hat
 fort
 him
 hun
 (th
 it be
 con
 sett
 poss
 pass
 fals
 ther
 it is
 phil

which priuiledge I thinke the Minister haue not. But they neuer taught that the Scripture, which they alledged, was the singular and sole rule of all truth, and that they spake not but by the mouth of the Scripture, as these Pretenders professe, and thyr poore flocke (which thinke they are as good as theyr wordes) perswade themselves.

3. If he that buckle with the Minister be learned, and will, after he hath often driuen the deere from his fortresse of the pure worde, course him alonge the plaine champion of humane and philosophicall reasons (though, according to my aduise, it be ordinarily more expedient, to content our selues with that before sett downe) for to cure him, if it be possible, after the a boue said he may passe to the examen of the truth, or falshod of his consequence: whether the propositions, from which it is deduced (be they taken from philosophy or holy writt) be true

or false; and whether the forme of the argument be according to the rules of Philosophy, and so deny that which the Minister assumed falsely. Still hauing in minde that the Minister is putt to the prooffe, not the Catholick, who beares the personne of the party instructed; & be sure not to change that personne. For the drift of all the Ministers fetches is, to vnload himself of that obligation to prooue his consequence: which he will bring to passe by this sleight, if he can make him, that defends, the disputant. For example. In the argument proposed. *That body which is in heauen, is not on the earth; The body of Iesus Christ is in heauen; Therefore it is not on the earth.* You shall deny the first proposition, and lett the Minister prooue it. If that his proofes come on to long, & he enter to farre into Philosophicall quiddities, lett the Catholicke note that it is in his free choice, to curbe the Minister short when he listeth;

demaunding him, if all the propositions which he hath brought to prooue his consequence, be in the Scripture, or no. If they be, lett him bring them forth. Many of them questionles are drawne out of Philosophy, or grounded vpon humane reasons. If they be not, the Minister which out of them inferres his consequence, doth not deduce it out of the pure word, or (which is all one) prooues not by consequence deduced out of the pure and only word, that the Catholicke erreth, which was that he vndertooke; and moreover denieth his Cōfession of faith: for he drawes his cōsequence ioyntly out of the word of God, and out of diuers propositions which are not in holie write. Is not this to flinch from their worde, and to renounce their articles of faith? or rather do not the Minister & his confession of faith abuse people, in promising that which they neither do, nor canne performe.

Behold a breefe, and easie methode
 to encounter all Ministers and Se-
 ctaries. Is it not obuius euen for
 those, who are not students in deu-
 nity, to putt it in practise? There
 needs no more but eyes to see, and
 to vnderstande English, to know if
 the pure word without additions,
 interpretations, or consequences of
 others, do say such a thing, or no.
 Do you not by this meanes euident-
 ly perceauē, that all the Ministers are
 abusers, and how the whole troope
 of Sectaries is misledde? Yea I dare
 say double abusers. For first the Mi-
 nister abuseth men, in that he pro-
 miseth by the pure word to shew
 them that, which he would haue
 them beleue: next, that he will by
 the pure word lay open their errors
 pretended, and yett performeth nei-
 ther the one, nor the other. Where-
 fore the ministers promising in their
 31. and 5. articles to performe them
 both, and yet effecting neither, as by
 the forsaide practise is made euident;

are
 sto
 Can
 dec
 pro
 sho
 all
 tha
 poi
 abu
 foll
 7
 See
 seek
 Cor
 wor
 acco
 nor
 wh
 &il
 euic
 you
 syde
 faic
 That
 as it

are impostours, and double impostours: as this methode, which euery Catholick may vse, doth apparently declare. And so I haue fulfilled my promise, which was to lay downe a short and easie methode, by which all Catholiques may evidently shew that each Minister in all, and euery point of his pretended religion, is an abuser, & consequently that all their followers are abused.

This therfore is my aduice to all Sectaries, to those especially which seeke sincerely theyr Saluation. Your Confession promisseth you the pure word of God, and you suppose that, according to that promise, there is nothing in your articles of fayth, which is not in the pure word; Praise this methode, and you shall evidently, and easily perceauce how you are abused. Place on the one syde the Principall articles of your faith, which I haue cited before.

That original sinne remaines after Baptisme as it is a fault. That Iesus Christ is our

only

only Advocate. That faith alone iustifieth,
 and which is cheefe of all. *That the B.*
Sacrament is a figure of the body of our Sa-
uiour, which is eaten by faith. Then o-
 uer against each of these articles, set
 downe the textes, which are cited
 in the margent for eache of them
 (doubtles if you had any plaine text
 of Scripture, which taught that
 which is in that article, it wold haue
 been coated in the margent) & you
 shall cleerly see, that the pure word,
 setting aside interpretations, and
 Ministeriall consequences, hath not
 that which is in your article: neither
 is there required ought but your
 eyes, and skill to reade, to see whe-
 ther that be in the pure word or no.
 And that your Ministers preach, that
 the Scripture is easie, and that euery
 one there may learne his owne sal-
 uation; you vnderstand I ame sure
 signification of English: why then
 finde you not in the pure word that,
 which the Ministers make you be-
 leeuē? Assure your selues if you find

h, it not, it is because it is not there.
B. Confront therefore the place cited
4- in the margent of the article, with
o- the article, and you shall see how
set egregiously you are mocked. And
ed that you may see this more manife-
m stly, doe this following. Write in
ext one line one article, or if it haue
nat many partes, one only clause of the
ue same. And if you finde any text of
ou Scripture cited for that article, or
rd, peece therof, write in a second line
nd the words of the text cited, vnder the
not other line. If you find no text cited
her (as in many places there is not) put
our vnder the first line a cypher; for that
he- if there were any text to authorize
no. that article, it would be cited. This
hat being donne, compare the first line
ery with the second: If you find in the
fal- second line a cypher, you are cleerly
ure cosened. If you find a text of Scrip-
hen ture, see if that, being precisely ta-
hat, ken without medly of some thing
be- els (that is to say, you must vnderst-
find ande; this signifieth; or the like;) con-

aine that article proposed ; if it do
 not, know that you are deceaued.
 I my self haue paralelled these ar-
 ticles with the textes alledged in the
 margent ; take you but the like
 paines, and I will assure you that in
 steed of the pure word, you shall oft
 tymes finde a cypher ; other tymes
 in the text cited you shall not find
 one worde of the article ; and in
 breefe you shall not find there one
 article, or entiere clause of those in
 Controuerisy between vs. Behold
 how you are deluded.

A
 CO
 the
 co
 ho
 she
 tur
 red
 cle
 wh
 the

Abr
 Ca
 ho
 Ca
 hi
 To
 Coun
 to tal
 articl
 with
 after

**ARTICLES OF THE
CONFESSION OF FAITH OF**
the pretended reformed Churchs,
confronted with the pure word of
holy writt; Where it is euidently
shewed, that the textes of Scrip-
ture, euen in the Geneua Bible, ci-
ted in the margent of these arti-
cles, conteine nothing of that,
which those articles teach against
the Catholick faith.

Which is

*A breefe & easy meanes, by which euery
Caluinist may manifestlie perceane
how he is abused, and wherby each
Catholicke may shew the same vnto
him.*

To saue you the paines (deceaued
Countrymen) which I wished you
to take, I haue heere confronted the
articles of your faith controuerted,
with the places cited in the margēt,
after the fashion before sett downe,

and haue cited these textes according to the Geneua translation. Compare them with the beginning at the 24. article.

In this article, these clauses following are sett downe without any text, cited in the margent, for proof of any of them; wherefore in steede of Scripture, I wil giue you vnder euery clause for prooffe a Cypher.

Article 24.

1. *We hold that Purgatory is an Illusion.*

Prooffe. o.

2. *By the abuse and deceit of Satan, Monasticall vowes were introduced.*

Prooffe. o.

3. *Out of the same vware-houuse proceeded Pilgrimages.*

Prooffe. o.

4. *Out of the same vware-houuse was brought in Auricular Confession.*

Prooffe.

o.

5. Out of the same vware-houſe
ſprang Indulgences.

Prooffe.

o.

6. Out of the same vware-houſe
proceeded all other things, by
vvhich vve thinke to merite
grace and ſaluation.

Prooffe.

o.

7. VVe reiect all others meanes,
vvhich men preſume to haue,
to reconcile themſelues to
God, as derogatory from the
death, and paſſion of Ieſus
Chriſt.

Prooffe.

o.

8. It is lawfull for vs to pray but
only according to that forme,
vvhich God ſett downe in
his vvord.

Prooffe.

o.

In the 31. article you ſay. The e-
ſtate

State of the Church in our times was interrupted, and hath failed; that God hath raised some after an extraordinary manner to renew the same, being ruined and desolate.

Prooffe. o.

Behold how the Ministers, and theyr Confession of faith do abuse you, and how often in one only article. They promise you, not to instruct you but by the holy Scripture, and proposing vnto you all these clauses to be beleueed, they prooue none of them by any text of Scripture, nor bring as much as one place of Scripture for confirmation of them. Examine the articles, you will finde more then a hundred clauses as well affirmatiues, as negatives, for prooffe wherof there is no text coated, because in deed they haue it not, iudge then if you be abused or no.

And who, I pray you, can in equity accuse another, vnles he produce some lawe commaunding, or prohibiting some thing violated by the party accused? Euery accusation, commended to be truly an accusation, not a calumny, must be founded vpon the breach of some lawe, and accompanied with it proofes. These Reformers doe not only accuse, but making themselves iudges, doe condemne of Superstitions, forgery, and high treason against the deuine Maiesty; the holy Fathers, and vs all besides in those 8. poyntes sett downe (and in diuers others which I omit) pronouncing their bloody sentence, by which they declare both them and vs to be superstitious, deceauers, instruments of Satan in the promulgations of those diuelish illusions rehearsed. This sentence pronounced, for execution of the same they haue ouerthrowen our Monasteries; prophaned our holy places; and set fire on our

Churches. Of what crime doe they
accuse vs, do they condemne vs?
what deuine law doe they prooue to
haue ben violated by vs? They
neyther prooue, nor so much as
cite any law, any letter of holy
write, against which the holy Fa-
thers & we haue offended. And yet
they accuse vs, they condemne vs.
Shameles wretches! but yet withall
impudent liars! They promise, not
to behaue themselves but only as
instruments of the holy Scripture,
and not to propose ought but that;
And yet they pronounce the eight
forsayd sentences, without citing
one sole passage of the Scripture.
See, o you sectaries, how palpably
they abuse you. But to see this more
cleerly, and withall to take away
from the Ministers all meanes to
circumuent you to your vtter ruine.

Consider with like attention
that which ensueth. In the 5. arti-
cle they wold make you beleue
that the pure word, which is contained in

they
 e vs?
 ue to
 They
 ch as
 holy
 y Fa-
 nd yet
 ne vs.
 ithall
 e, not
 nly as
 pture,
 that;
 eight
 citing
 pture.
 lpably
 s more
 away
 nes to
 ruine
 ention
 5. arti-
 cleene
 teined in

the bookes of holy Scripture, is the rule of
 all truth, and that nothing must be
 beleueed, but that which is in the
 pure word. This article is of great
 consequence; for reposing and
 grounding your selues vppon this,
 and not vppon any other thing, you
 reiect all the traditions of the Ro-
 mane Church; you giue your sen-
 tences of condemnation against vs;
 you will not allow of *neither Anti-
 quity, nor Custome, nor Multitude, nor
 Humane wisdom, nor Sentences, nor In-
 hibitions, nor Edicts, nor Lawes, nor Coun-
 cells, nor Visions, nor Miracles.* And al-
 beit all these make against your do-
 ctine, you make no bones thereof,
 you scorne them all, saying that you
 will nothing but the pure Scrip-
 ture, all the rest proceeds from men
 subiect vnto errours; and *that all o-
 ther things must be examined, ruled, and
 reformed according to the same pure word.*
 This article therefore is of great con-
 sequence; and with good reason, to
 be beleueed, ought to be found in

the holy Scripture; which if the Ministers should frame in the force of their owne braynes, they deserue doubtles to be banished all honest company, as men impudently bold, which seeke to make the world renounce all things abouesaid, for a proposition of their owne inuention; and contradict themselves: hauing before said, they would only carry themselves as the organe of the whole Scripture. Let vs therefore set downe in one line first the article, then vnder that the text, cited in the margent for prooffe thereof.

Article 5.

The vwritten vword is the rule of all truth: or els, as you commonly say. Nothing is to be beleued, but that which is in the vwritten vword. In the margent of this article you cite 4. textes for prooffe of the contents.

1. Text.

*You shall not add any thing to the
worde which I commaunde,
nor take any thing from the
same. Saith Moyſes to the
people of Iſrael. Deuter. 4.
Verſ. 2.*

2. Text.

*That which I commaund you, that
shall you doe, neither shall you
adde any thing, nor diminish.
Deut. 12. Verſ. 32.*

Examen.

Heere is not any worde of the ar-
ticle in theſe paſſages, for you ney-
ther finde (*written word*) nor (*rule of
all truth*) which are the two termes
of the article; wherefore this pure
word doth not conteine that, which
the article affirmeth. Lett vs weigh
it more exactly. 1. Moyſes ſpake
vnto the Iewes of that only, which
he ordained, to witt of the Iudaicall
law, and of no other. 2. he ſpake not

of the written worde, of which alone the article is, but vniuersally of the word. 3. Albeit he spake vnto Christians, and of the only written word: haue we increased the booke of Moyse: haue we added ought vnto them? 4. Thinke you that the *Prophets* composing new Scriptures, and ioyning them with the booke of Moyse, haue infringed this precept? 5. if Moyse forbid to beleue any thing but that, which he ordained; we must neither beleue the Psalmes of Dauid, nor the other *Prophets*, nor the Gospell: for he ordained not that which these conteyne. Perceauce you not how ridiculous a thing it is, to alledge this text, to verify by the pure word your article? which sayth, *the written word is the rule of all truth*. The same article is prooued by an other passage. Galat 1. Vers. 8.

3. Text.

Although we, or an Angell from

*heaven preach otherwise, then
that which we have preached
unto you, be he accursed.*

Examen.

In this text I neither read (*written word*) nor (*rule of all truth*) which are the two termes of the article; wherefore the text hath not that, which the article teacheth. Nay it containes not one only word therof, come to the examen. 1. Is there in the text anie mention of the written word? of which onlie we dispute, and the article speakes of no other. 2. Who knoweth not that the Apocalipse was reuealed, and writt after that epistle of S. Paule? and yet besides that, which S. Paule euangelized, it also must be beleued. Or is he which preacheth, and beleueth the Apocalipse accursed? Or rather is S. Paule accursed, who preached manie things afterward, which are not in that epistle to the Galathians? who is there of so small capacitie,

that in the reading of this chapter doth not see, that the word (*otherwise*) is the same in sense with (*against*.) The Apostle, as it is manifest at the verie opening of the epistle, crieth out against those, which together with the law of Christ, would ioyne Circumcision against the doctrine of the Apostles. The wordes immediatlie going before, make the matter more cleere. *I maruaile* saith he to the Galat: 1. Verſ. 6. 7. 8. *that leauing him, who hath called you vnto the grace of Christ, you are so soone transferred vnto an other Gospell: which is not another, vnles there be some that trouble you, & will inuert the Gospell of Christ: But although we, or an Angell from heauen preach to you otherwise then that, which we haue preached to you, be he accursed.* Is it not euident that S. Paul reiecteth that only, which is against that which he had preached? Then it is apparent also, that this text makes nothing for that, which the article contains. to witt: That

the written word is the rule of all truth.

The last passage, cited for the for-
said article, is out of the Apocalypse
22. Verſ. 18. in theſe wordes.

4. Texte.

*I teſtifie to euerie one, hearing
the vvordes of the prophecie of
this booke. If any man ſhall add
to theſe things, God ſhall adde
vppon him the plagues vvritten
in this booke. And if anie man
ſhall diminish of the vvords of
the booke of this prophecy, God
ſhall take away his part out of
the booke of life, and out of the
holy Citty, and of theſe things
that be vvritten in this booke.*

Neither do I reade in this paſſage
(written word of the entyre Bible) of
which only the Article intreats, nor
(rule of all truth) wherfore the text
ſayth not, that the pure word of the en-
tire Bible is the rule of all truth, as the
Article auerreth, rather the text

consents not in one only terme with the article. Examine it. 1. Is it not manifest, that S. Iohn spake not but of the word conteyned in the Apocalipse? which the Ministers will not allowe to be the rule of all truth; to what purpose then for prooffe of that Article, *That the pure word of the entire Bible is the rule of all truth*, do they bring out this text? 2. if S. Iohn sayd, that nothing must be added to that word of the Apocalipse in this sense, and after this Ministerial paraphrase (*that nothing must be beleueed which is not therein contained*) then he which should beleue the Ghospell, the Epistles of S. Paul, of S. Iohn, and others, and the old testament, should be accursed. Where were the Ministers wits, thinke you, when to proue that nothing must be beleueed, but that which is in the Bible, they alledged this passage? 3. To adde to the Apocalipse, is to thrust in something as part of that sacred booke: doe we

doe so? What frantik people are your Ministers? and you, o Calvinists? how grossely doth your Confession of sayth abuse you, which treats you in such a fashion, as if you had not eyes to reade, nor iudgment to vnderstand the signification of one pure text? How many Ministeriall glosses ar heere wanting, to make these textes speake that, which this article contaynes? Lett vs go on.

Whence haue you, that the booke of the old and new Testament are holy Scripture? how know you that these booke are Canonically? *By the inward perswasion of the holy Ghost,* so you aunswere in the 4. article *That he makes vs decerne them from other Ecclesiasticall booke.* It is not then by the holy Scripture that you know this, for your inward perswasion is not the written word. Consequently it is false, *That the pure word is the rule of all truth, and that all things must be examined, ruled, and reformed by the same.* For it is not the rule of this ve-

rity, and that of greatest consequence: to witt, that the bookes of the old and new Testament are canonicall, and written by deuine reuelation. Again, to reiect any booke from the number of the Canonickall (as for example you doe reiect that of Tobias, and admitt the Gospell of S. Mathew) you guide not your selues by this rule of the pure word, but, as you giue it out, of the inward perswasion of the holy Ghost. See how your articles destroy each other. Tell me farther. Do you hold that one may, and ought to baptize little infants? That we must not rebaptize hereticques, which haue been baptized in the name of the B. Trinity; that we must keepe holy sunday, and not saturday; you belecue that the Mother of God remayned alwayes a virgin. Notwithstanding you finde not one text of Scripture, to iustify any of these points; why do you then contradict your selues and your article, which

teacheth, *that the written word is the rule of all truth.* Doth not S. Paul in the. 2. to the Thessalon. 2. vers. 15. exhort laying . *stand, and hold fast the instructions (our translation reads traditions) which you haue learned eyther by our word, or by our epistle.* Note that he makes mention of the word besides that, which is written in Scripture ; and in the 2. to Timothe. 2. Vers. 2. *The things which thou hast heard of me by many witnesses, these commend to saythfull men, which shall be fitt to teach others also.* Doe not you perceauē a diuine word, taught not by writing, but by word of mouth ? In the. 1. to the Cor. 11. Vers. 34. *Other things I will set in order when I come.* Such ordinances by word of mouth, are they not as well deuine as those, which are sett downe in writing : I omit many other authorities to this purpose, by the way only citing these, for that it is not my intent to iustify, and prooue vnto you in this treatise that, which

we belecue. My only scope is to shew vnto you, that you are abused; and that the pure word teacheth no such thing, as your articles report. This haue I performed in this article, which I haue examined with the textes cited for the same; for the Article saith, that the written word is the rule of all truth; and in the passages alledged, we neyther read *written word*, nor *the rule of all truth*. Wherefore they haue not that which the article saith, otherwise, knowing to reade, we should see it there. For conclusion heereof the Calvinists, in this article of greatest importance, are therefore abused, and by consequence in all the rest I before marked, which are out of this deduced against vs, which are in great number. Reuew them, and in so many points acknowledg your selues deceaued.

I haue at large examined this article, as well for that, as hath been shewed, it is of greatest importance;

as also for that the falshood therof being discouered, the Ministers are bereaued of the most efficacious, and ordinary meanes they had to defend themselues, in these conflicts; for they alwayes fly for refuge to this Proposition, *That nothing must be beleueed, bus that which is in the Scripture* Their custome is to question vs, *where finde you Purgatory in the Scripture? or the reall presence of the body of Iesus Christ in the sacrament of the Altar &c.* For, say they, *if it be not there, it is superstition to beleuee it.* And by this meanes, in lieu of reforming our pretended abuses by the pure word, they cunningly engage vs to prooue our faith. A wily deuise. Catholicks looke vnto their fingers, and be sure that when they make you such questions, you take not vppon you to be disputants: but allthough you haue many authorities, yett bring no place of Scripture to iustify your cause. Marke well the wilines of the Aduersaries. They are bound

by their.31.article to reforme vs, and by their.5.to do it by the pure word: by this disguise and faire apparence drawing many to their part. But their practise is after another fashion. For knowing well that they are neuer able to performe that, which they haue bound themselves vnto, to disingage themselves from this obligation, by a fine deuise they endeouour to make vs the plaintiffs, questioning vs after the fashion aforesaid. And if in awnswere of their questions, you bring some expresse textes for your self, behold, by this the Minister hath gott his neck out of the coller, and hauing before hand quitt himself of all Anquity, Fathers, Miracles &c. he will turne of the Scripture at his owne pleasure, and in fine delude you, though you haue ten cleere textes for your purpose: Of this we haue dayly experience. Handle him in an other fashion. You must neuer lett him change his coate. He is obliged

by the Confession of his faith to shew you by the pure word your errours; hold him to it there to his testimonies of the pure word, which must sett downe your pretended errours; Doe but this, and I warrant you the Minister will quickly be brought vpon his knees; and haue a care you release him not, but keepe him downe. But how? vrge him still with this, that he shew you some expresse text of Scripture which sayth, *That there is no Purgatory;* or *Tbat, the body of Iesus Christ is not in the Eucharist.* It is his charge to do it, who hath pawned his word to shew vs by the pure word our errours. But if he hope to scape the torture by this sleight, saying that he sufficiently sheweth our errour in that (as he sayth) we cannot shew by the Scripture Purgatory, or the reall presence: Haue a care, that though you haue many cleere textes on your side, bring none, make not your selues Plaintiffs, for so he will

be deliuered from the rack ; but
 presse him eagrelly that he shew you
 that he promised, or at least, *that no-
 thing must be beleueed but that, which is
 in the Scripture* (for by this maxime
 alone doth he argue you of errour)
 And then that after he hath donne
 this, you will produce your places.
 Not being able to shew this propo-
 sition in the whole Scripture (as by
 the precedent examen I haue shewd
 he cannot) he is driuen to a non plus,
 nor hath he any meanes to scape a-
 way. Thus shall you shew breefly &
 euidently, that their 31. and 5. articles
 are false, which promised to reforme
 our pretended abuses by the pure
 word, and cannot do it : And that
 the Ministers are egregious impo-
 stours, which vnder such a faire pre-
 text haue seduced so many thou-
 sands of soules. And you of the pre-
 tended religion, put but your Mini-
 sters to this triall, and you will see
 them presently fall speechles, and
 your selues apparently abused.

Before we passe any farther, I cannot omit to examine breeffie one clause of the 24. article, which I before let passe, for that for it there is cited in the margent a texte, which is not donne in the other clauses.

An other clause of the 24. article.

Out of the vware-hovvse of the deuill, proceede the forbidding to marrie, and the free vse of meates, and the ceremonious obseruation of some daies.

Text.

In the last times certaine shall depart from the faith, attending to spirits of errours, forbidding to marry, commaunding to abstaine from meates, vvhich God created for the faithfull; to receaue them vvith thanks giuing, for euerie creature of God is good, and nothing to be reiected. 1. Timothy. 4. Vers. 3.

Examen.

By this clause the Article seemes to reprehend the Catholique Church, but wrongfullie. For. 1. shee forbids not to marrie; otherwise no Catholick could be married, but that he must breake the precept of the Church; shee onlie causeth that to be kept, which God in his Scriptures commaundeth: to witt, that men fulfill their vowes, and for this cause that Preefts, and others which haue vowed chastity, and continencie, obserue their vowes, whereby it followeth that they may not marrie. Neither doth the text alledged say ought to the contrarie. 2. I admire the little iudgment of the Ministers; doe they thinke that the Physicians *commaunding* their patients to *abstaine from some meates* for a time to recouer their health, doe goe against the Apostle, and teach a *deuillish doctrine*?

I am more amazed at the impudency of these men, whose reading

the prohibition of some meates
 made by the Apostles, gathered to-
 geather in the 1. Councell. Act. 15.
 vers. 28. in these wordes *it hath see-*
med good to the Holy Ghost and to vs, to
lay no further burden vpon you, then
these necessary things. Among other
 things that you abstaine from bloud and
 that which is strangled. They dare, a-
 busing the text cited, say, not with-
 out execrable blalphemy, against
 the holy Apostles, and against the
 holy Ghost. *That from the ware-howse*
of the diuell proceedeth the prohibition of
some meates; terming heereby the
 holy Ghost sathan, and the first sa-
 cred Councell of the Apostles, the
 ware-howse of the deuill, and theyr
 prohibition an abuse and illusion. S.
 Paul, which assisted at that sacred
 Councell, is farr of from censuring
 in that manner that precept, which
 he with the rest had decreed to ab-
 staine from certayn meates. But forsee-
 ing that there wold come hereti-
 ques, that wold forbidde mariage as

a thing in it self vlawfull, and in-
 uented by the deuill; and some
 meates as naught in themselves and
 of their owne nature (so did the
 Maniche, Marcion and Tatian, as
 S. Augustine, with others recount-
 eth) these the Apostle condemneth.
 The Church is farr distant from this
 errour. Thus doe S. Augustine, S.
 Chrysostome, S. Hierome, and S.
 Ambrose expound this place; and
 the reason which the Apostle bring-
 eth for his condemnation contei-
 ned in these words, *every creature of
 God is good*, doth authorize the same.
 And it belongs to the Minister, who
 is plaintife, to prooue the contrarie.
 Finally, the Church doth not abso-
 lutelie commaund to abstaine from
 meates, for it forbiddeth not fish,
 whiche is meate; nor at all times, but
 onlie certaine particular meates, and
 at certaine times; which thing the
 Apostle reprehends not, who spea-
 keth of these, who absolutelie *com-
 maunde to abstaine from meates*, and that

without limitation to any times. 3. for the prooffe of the 3. clause of the obseruation of daies, the article hath cited no texte, in that therefore it deceaueth.

An other clause of the 24. article.

IESVS CHRIST is giuen vs for the sole Aduocate: All that vvhich men haue imagined about the intercession of Saintes departed, is nought els but an abuse and deceit of Sathan.

Examen.

The onlie pointe of controuersie between vs in the first clause of this article, is of the word (*sole*) for thes two textes are cited in margent, for the second clause nothing, the first in the 1. Timoth. 2. 5.

Texte.

There is one only God, and one onlie mediatur between God and men, man IESVS CHRIST.

78
Examen.

I will set downe the texte entierly, to make it more cleere that he saith not that, which the article teacheth: behold the Apostles wordes.

God vwill that all men be saued, and come to the knowvledge of truth, for there is one only God, and one only mediatur betvveene God and men, man IESVS CHRIST vwho gaue himselfe for reedemption of all.

I finde not in this passage alledged the termes (of *Aduocate*, of *intercession*) of which we debate, neither finde I thar Saints are shutt out from that office of Aduocate, as saith the article. And if the Minister say that the name of mediatur, as S. Paul vnderstands it, is the same with Aduocate; I aunswear first, that the Minister, or rather his Confession of faith, must prooue that the

name

name of mediator is taken for mediator, and Aduocate by intercession, and not for mediator and Aduocate by redemption; He I say must prooue this, and that by the pure word alone, otherwise the place alledged consenteth not with the Confession of faith, neither doth it reiect the intercession of Saintes.

2. I make aunswere (which by the place entirely cited doth appeare) that S. Paul spake of one Mediatour (they are the Apostles owne words) who *bath giuen himselfe a redemption for all*: of such a Mediatour he saith that he is one alone, neither doe the Catholickes teach that the Saintes are such mediators. This passage therefore prooues nothing against Catholicques, neither doth it say that IESVS CHRIST is giuen vs for our sole Aduocate, nor that to beleue the intercession of Saints is an abuse, and deceit of the deuill.

3. This word (*sole*) hath beene added by the Ministers in the Geneua

Bible for it is neither in the Greeke nor Latin texte: and S. Paule to the Galat. 3. calleth Moyſes Mediatour.

The ſeconde paſſage, alledged for this claue in their Confession, is in the 1. epiſtle of S. Iohn. 2. Verſ. 1. 2.

2. Texte.

Theſe things I write vnto you, that you ſinne not. But & if any one ſinne, we haue an Aduocate with the Father, IESVS Chriſt the iuſt: for he is the propitiation for our ſinnes, and not for ours only; but alſo for thoſe of the whole worlde.

Examen.

Is it not manifeſt, that he ſpeaketh not of euery Aduocate, but of an Aduocate which is a propitiation for the ſinnes of the whole world, to witte by the effuſion of his bloud? The Catholiques hold not any other ſuch Aduocate, but our Saviour. To what purpoſe then is it to

bring this passage, which toucheth
 not that which is in controuersie?
 And marke well that it is the Mini-
 sters parte, who is Plaintife, to shew
 that the name of Aduocate is heere
 taken for anie intercessour, euen
 him, who is not a propitiation for
 the sinnes of the world by his pas-
 sion; and all this by the pure worde.
 2. Besides, if the Minister will perti-
 naciously vnderstand by the name of
 Aduocate him, who is not a propi-
 tiation for the sinnes of the world
 which is of his owne head with-
 out the pure word, yea against the
 pure word alledged.) This word
 (only) of which wee only striue, not
 being in this text, this place ver-
 eth not this article *that IESVS Christ*
only Aduocate.

et vs come to the 20. Article.
 These are the wordes.

Article. 20.

*WVe belecue that vve are
 made partakers of that iustice*

(to witt Christian) by faith
alone.

Textes cited in the Margent of
this Article.

*Man is iustified by faith,
vvithout the vvorkes of the
lawe. Rom. 3. Vers. 28.*

*Man is not iustified by the
vvorkes of the Lawe, but
only by the faith of I E S V S
Christ. Galat. 2. Vers. 16.*

*Before faith came vv
vvere kept vnder the lawe,
shut vp vnto that faith vv
vvwas to be reuealed. Therfor
the lawe vvwas our Pedago
gue in Christ, that vv
be iustified by faith, but vv
that faith is come nouw vv
are not vnder a Pedagogue
Galat. 3. Vers. 23.*

Examen.

I reade not one word, in all these
textes, of the workes of Christian
faith, of which alone, and of no o-
thers we speake, and hold necessary
to iustification. It is manifest that
this pure word alledged, speaketh
of workes of the Iudaicall religion,
styled commonly by S. Paul by the
name of the Lawe, and not of the
workes of Christian Religion.
These passages therefore say onlie,
that Christian faith without Cir-
cumcision, and other ceremonies of
the Iewes, doth iustifie. Who de-
nieth this? is this all one, or as much
as to say that Christian faith, with-
out the workes, which proceed
from the said faith in Iesus Christ,
as is penance, doth iustifie? Which
is that the article teacheth. Where-
fore this pure worde seconds not
that which the article sayeth. I am
amazed at the impudency, or igno-
rance of the Ministers: S. Paul dis-
coursing so largely in five whole
chapters of that epistle to the Gala-

—thians, against those which would
 ioyne with Christian faith Circum-
 cision, and other workes of Iudaisme;
 and the very titles of those
 chapters in the Geneva translation
 noting the same: yet the aduersaries
 will alledge these against them, who
 hold that Christian workes are ne-
 cessarie to iustification. Open but
 the epistle, and thou wilt detest such
 abusers; the whole epistle sheweth
 that which I say. It shall suffice for
 prooffe heereof to cite the words of
 the .5. chapter. 2. verse. *Behold I tell
 you, that if you be circumcised, Christ shall
 proffit you nothing, and I testifie againe to
 euerie man circumciding himself, that he
 is a debter to doe the whole law; you are
 euacuated from Christ, that are iustified in
 the law. You are fallen from grace, for
 we by faith expect the hope of iustice. In
 IESVS Christ neither circumcision a-
 uaieth ought, nor prepuce, but faith wor-
 king by charity. Do not you falsefye?
 doth not S. Paul teach in these laste
 wordes the contrarie to your arti-*

ele? The Apostle opposeth Christian Religion, which is called faith in Christ, vnto the Iudaicall religion, which is named the lawe; and teacheth that this later is not necessary to iustification, but that the former sufficeth, and doth not oppose Christian faith to Christian workes. The last texte cited for the foresaid article, hath as little energy as the precedents. it is this of S. Iohn 3. Vers. 15. 16.

As Moyses exalted the Serpent in the desert, so must the sonne of man be exalted, that euerie one which beleeueth in him, perish not, but may haue life euerlasting. For so God loued the world, that he gaue his only begotten sonne, that euery one that beleeueth in him, perish not, but haue life euerlasting.

The word (only) of which only

is our variance, and which is in your article, teaching that faith only iustificieth, is not in this text: wherefore this, vnles you add thereto the word (*only*) makes nothing to your purpose; and how often doth this speech, *to beleue in IESVS Christ, signifie to professe the Ghospell, and liue according to the same?* for faith, saith S. Iames in the 1. chapter 17. verse. *If it haue not workes is dead.* Doth not S. Paul. Galat. 5. Vers. 6. say that *that which iustificieth is faith, working by charitie?* Doth not our Sauour pronounce this sentence; if thou wilt enter into life keepe the commaundements? But I am not bound to prooue, that faith alone without Christian workes doth not iustifie, it is you that are engaged to prooue by the pure worde, that *that alone* doth iustifie; *alone*, I say, for of that *alone* doe we dispute. In the 11. article it is said that.

Article 11.

Originall sinne after Baptisme is still sinne, as it is a fault; howbeit the condemnation thereof is taken away in the children of God, who of his mercifull goodnes doth not impute it vnto them.

In prooffe of this is alledged one only place in the margent. Rom. 7. Vers. 7.

Texte.

What shall we say then? is the lawe sinne? God forbid, but sinne I did not know, but by the lawe, for concupiscence I knew not, vnles the law did say, thou shalt not couet.

Examen.

Here is not in the text one word contained in the article; wherefore this Confession, promising to say nothing but by the pure word, abu-

seth'vs in this point. Go on.

Let vs examine the 36. and 37. articles, which speake of the B. Sacrament: which since it is obscurely spoken of, for more perspicuity I will borrow somewhat out of your Catechisme.

The 1. clause of the 36. article.

WVe testifie that the Supper is a testimonie of the unitie, which we haue with I E-SVS Christ; whose body (you say in your Catechisme in the 53. lesson or Sunday) is not included under the bread, nor his bloud within the chalice, that we must not seeke him in these corruptible elementes. For prooffe you alleadge this texte.

Text.

The cuppe of benediction which

which we do blesse, is it not
the communion of the bloud of
Christ? and the bread which
we do breake, is it not the
communion of the bodie of
Christ? for being manie, we
are one only bread, and one
only body, for we all partake
of one only bread. 1. Corinth.
10. Vers. 16. 17.

Examen.

I reade not in this text (testimony
of the vnity with IESVS Christ) the
text therfore agrees not with the
article. But I reade communion of
bloud, communion of body, which is a
different matter from testimony of
vnity with IESVS Christ, and she-
weth that the body of IESVS Christ
may be founde in these corruptible ele-
ments, vnder the accidents of bread
and wine; which this article de-
nieth.

An other clause of the same article.

In the supper are signss, which testify that the body and bloud of IESVS Christ, serueth no lesse for the soule to eat and drinke, then bread and wine doth for the body. These Articles say not in expresse termes that the body of IESVS Christ is not in the Eucharist to couer with obscurity theyr errour; to disperse this darknes I must borrow some light from theyr Catechisme in the 53. lesson. we must not (sayth it) vnderstand that the body is inclosed within the bread, nor the bloud within the chalice; but contrariwise, to haue the verity of this sacrament, we must lift vp our hartes on high to heauen, where IESVS Christ is, and not seeke him in these corruptible elements. For this clause you cite two textes.

1. Texte.

I am the liuing bread, that came downe from heauen: if any man eat of this bread, he shall liue for euer, and the bread which I will giue is

*my flesh, which I will giue
for the life of the world .
Iohn. 6. Vers. 51.*

Examen.

First I reade not in this text (*signes
which testify*) but this expressely,
that *Christ is the living bread*, not co-
mon bread made of flowre, and ba-
ked; but *which is his flesh*, which
sayth he, *I will giue for the life of the
world*; As also in the geuing of it he
sayd, *Take, This is my body, which
shal be giuen for you*. Was it a signe,
or figure of his body, which was
nayled one the crosse: was it not
his proper body? This clause then is
false. 2. The ministers, whoe haue
promised to propose nothing but
the pure Scripture, how doe they
thrust vppon vs this clause so wei-
ghty, *The body of IESVS Christ is not
contained, and included within the bread,
nor the blood &c.* Without any writ-
ten word? see theyr fraude, and
how well they keepe their word.

in a matter of greatest moment.

2. Texte.

I E S V S tooke bread, and
having giuen thanks brake
it, and said take, eate. This is
my bodie, vvhich is broken for
you; do this in commemoration
of me. In like manner after
supper he tooke the cuppe say-
ing, this cuppe is the new te-
stament in my blood, this do
ye, as often as you shall drinke
therof in remembrance of me.
1. Corinth. 11. Vers. 24.

Examen.

Who can finde out in this texte.
Signes which testify; figure; signe of the
body of *I E S V S* Christ; which is not in
the bread, nor the bloud in the chalice?
all vvhich the article teacheth. The
text then helps them nothing; nay
how could the text more cleerly
reiect the aduersaries beleefe, which
is: that the body is not vnder the bread.

nor the bloud within the chalice. Let the Calvinistes consider if they be abused or no: The Ministers haue entred bondes to shew by the pure word, That the supper is a *signe which testifieth, a figure of the body of our saviour, which is not vnder the bread, and of the bloud which is not within the chalice*: and to cancell theyr obligations, they bring for paiment this texte of Scripture, in which (being it is written downe) if you reade it not, eyther you want your sight, or they deceaue you. Rather see you not the contrary? then say they are doubled iuglers.

An other clause of that Article.

After affirming that Iesvs Christ doth nourish, and quicken vs with the substance of his body, and of his bloud, that which the Catholic-kes belecue also; they add, (in which we disagree) without alledging any texte for the same (wherefore put vnderneath for prooffe a cypher as before.)

1. *WVe hold notwithstanding,
that this is donne spiritually.*

Proofe. o.

2. *The supper is a figure of the body,
or, In the supper is figured
the bodie of IESVS Christ.*

Proofe. o.

3. *Because the misterie of this sup-
per is celestially, it cannot be
taken but by faith, or to vse
their vulgar phrase, by the
mouth of faith: Those
which bring with them a
pure faith as a vessell, re-
ceave trulie that which the
signes testifie; commonlie
they say, That in the supper
is eaten the bodie of IESVS
Christ by the mouth of faith
and in the 53. Sunday of
their Catechisme, it is
said, to haue the veritie of*

*the Sacrament, we must lift
up our hartes to heauen
where it is.*

Prooffe.

o.

Behold many atticles, and of
greate consequence proued by a
Cypher. Behold how you are abu-
sed. The ministers make you beleue
all this, not being able to shew for
it any texte of Scripture. The con-
sequence will be, that your supper
is purely their owne inuention:
This by your principles I shew. For
you haue no pure textes which say
that, which you affirmatiuely be-
leue of the supper, of which you
hold those three thinges aforesayd
principally. *It is figure &c. that by the
mouthe of fayth the body eateh &c.* you
should distinctly sett downe that,
which of our fayth you deny in this
matter, from that which therein you
positiuely beleue: for how be it
that we did erre (of which I haue
shewed the contrary) and that your

negative propositions *I E S U S Christ is not in the Eucharist, and the like* were true; it followeth not that that, which you affirmatiuely belecue, most needes be true; and that you erre not therein. Because one goeth wrong one way, is he, which takes an other, certaine to goe right? may not both be out of their way? Examine therfore your assertions, and you finde not any shew of textes that reache, *that the supper is a figure of the body &c.* nor which *speake of the mouth of faith.* Consequently your whole supper is a humane inuention. Which being so, in my opinion in the eating a good capó, or a cock, you may more easely remember the death of the sonne of God, for that therein is made mention of the crowing of a cock; then in eating a bit of bread. For which cause you shall do more prudently, to make of them a figure & memorie, then of a peece of bread; which is no more holie, then that you eate commonlie at

your table.

It may be that some Calviniste, thinking himselfe better skilled in the Scriptures, then the Ministers which composed the Confession of faith, and cited for prooffe thereof those sacred textes they iudged most fauourable, will vrge, to prooue *the supper to be a figure*, that, which our Sauour said Iohn. 6. Verſ. 63. *It is the spirit which quickeneth, the flesh profiteth nothing, the words which I speake vnto you are spirit and life.* For answer were. 1. You must vnderstand, that your Ministers are at variance, whether in the 6. of S. Iohn anie thing be spoken of the supper. Calvin in the fourth booke of his Instit. cap. 17. §. 33. Kemnicius, and Zuinglius deny it. How then will you establish this firme article of your faith vpon so weake a foundation, doubted of by these of your owne faction? How can you serue your selues of that passage against vs, either for your figure, or for your *spiritually*?

2. I reade not in this text *figure*: and if anie one say that *spiritt* and *figure* is all one; I may not beleue him without his prooffe, and that by the pure Scripture. And who perceauces not how ridiculous this deuise is? the diuells are spirites, are they figures? the Angells and our soules are spirittes? are they also figures? God himself is he not a most pure spiritt? is he a figure? it belongs not to me to explicate this place. I only shew that the pure word saith not that, which the article conteineeth, & consequently the Ministers mock vs. Yet by the way, knowe that the sense of this texte is, that our Saviour would not giue vs to eate his flesh dead, and in peeces (as we eate of the ordinarie flesh, as the Capharnaïtes imagined) to eate of flesh in this manner, profitteeth nothing to saluation; but flesh animated by his spirite, and quickened by his deuine life; in this manner we eate it. In which fashion we cannot eate anie

and
figure
him
the
ues
is?
y fi.
ules
res?
pure
not
only
a not
meth,
mock
at the
r Sa-
re his
e eate
aphar.
esh in
ing to
by his
deuine
it. In
re anie

other flesh, for it must first be dead,
before it nourish vs. Remember
finally that I doe not by this Scrip-
ture prooue my faith, this suffiseth
me, that in these words you reade
*not either figure of body, or that we hold
that it is donne spiritually, in such manner
that the body is not contained there,* this,
I say, suffiseth to make you know
you are misledd. For since you reade
it not, (which doubtles if it were
there, you might) the pure word
warranteth not that which this ar-
ticle containeth.

Behold Syr the arte, which in this letter
I promised to discouer vnto you: is it not
a rare & worthy hunting-game? haue you
ere this scene such coursing? F. Veron in
teaching it me, told me that, which I know
will giue it no small luster in your eye:
that he receaued the origine, and substance
therof from the R. F. Gontery, which fa-
mous hunter was the authour, and inuen-
tour of this so efficacious, and facile sport;
who also vsed no other in his disputes a-
gainst the Ministers, iudging this the best,
and most powerfull of all. And you know
well, that that fearfull scourge of the Here-
ticks is most expert in these combats. And

being so beaten a soldiour in those warres, each prudent man wil make a great esteeme of his aduise herein. He hath putt to flight the Ministers of Dieppe, of Caen, of Sedan &c. and among the rest some Allmaines he founde at Tournalac. But how? Truly by no other meanes but this, by the pure Scripture alone, and that after the Geneva Translation, by the practise before set downe: Sauing that he bridleed them in more shortly, for he neuer suffered them in any point debated, to proceed by consequences, which they said they would deduce out of the Scripture, vnles they first subscribed, that they could not enter combate with vs by the pure written word.

I should now sende you the relation promised of this Conference, between F. Veron, and the Minister Hucher, but because the printer, by reason of the great frostes could not dispatch the same so soone, as I hoped; not to keepe you wholly in suspence, I send you the summary thereof, together with the meanes to buckle with the Sectaries. The whole Conference is vnder the presse, you shall haue it within eight daies; ioyned it to this fashion of hunting which I now send you, for that you will see the practise of this kinde of chace, vsed by the Father in this conflict. Heere will you also see, by this

arres, successefull and remarkable victory, the
 efficacy of this arte. It is scarcely possible
 to putt a man to more confusion, then the
 Minister was in. The fame of this victory
 strooke the sectaries to the harte. Seeing
 the title of this epistle before it was printed,
 they were much offended at it, but all
 partes thereof are easily iustified, by the
 Actes of the Conference signed. Behold
 out of them the Ministers owne wordes.
 He hauing promised to shew by the pure
 word, that *IESVS* Christ is not in the Eu-
 charist, after a little pressing said; *The truth*
is, that these words (the body of IESVS
Christ is not in the Eucharist) are not in the
Scripture. And after being vrged a little
 harder, he confessed besides twice, before
 all the assembly, that he had not any text in
 Scripture, which, setting aside all conse-
 quences, conteyned formally and expres-
 sly the sense of this proposition. *IESVS*
Christ is not in the Eucharist, which notwith-
 standing he before vndertooke to shew by
 the pure word; and so to reforme the Ie-
 suite in his errour. Is not this as much as
 Confesse to confesse, that he could not by the pure
 word reforme vs in this point? is not this
 fashion to forsake it? is not this to renounce the
 office and exercise of a reformer? thinke
 these fittes proceede from a merry
 heart? wherefore with reason the epistle
 bears for title *The Minister of Amiens con-*

strained to renounce the pure word of holy
 write: He stayed so long dumme, and in
 presence of so many personnes, and of
 such quality, that there is no tergiversati-
 on: and refused so long time in the third
 session, to come to the prooffe of that, in
 which the day before he was struck speech-
 les, or also to deale in any other point; that
 the flight is as euident, as the day light.
 VVherfore the epistle hath right vnto his
 title. VVithin few dayes you shall see the
 narration at large, well subscribed and sig-
 ned; in the meane tyme notwithstanding,
 for iustification of the summary thereof,
 sett downe in the beginning of this letter, I
 haue procured these subscriptions follo-
 wing.

*Subscriptions of the Conference, the
 summe vvhherof is contained in
 the beginning of this letter.*

VV E the subsigned Gentlemen of
 the Duke of Longueuille, being
 present with our said Lord at the Confe-
 rences, of which the narration is before set
 downe, do testifie that they haue truly pas-
 sed as it is declared. Giuen at Amyens the
 12. of February. 1615.

Pelletot, Foucaucourt, Le Cheualier
 de Moyencourt, Gondreuille, Tannere,
 Goustimenil, Courtaucnel.

*Certaine pointes collected out of this
practise, and other experiences of this
kind, reduced to six heads, for the
more warie proceeding of Catholiques
with Sectaries of our age.*

THE 1. point. Seeing that our new Se-
ctaries doe suppose vs Catholiques to
be deceaued, in our beleefe, and that they
ar sent to reforme vs by the *onlie vvritten*
vvord of Scripture, er the Catholique enter
into conference with anie Sectarie, let
him first demaund what he vnderstandeth
by the *onlie vvritten vvord of Scripture*: whi-
ther the Old and new Testament, with all
the parts of eche both, as we Catholiques
doe; or els what? Then let the Catholique
request the Sectarie to proue by the *onlie*
vvritten vvord, as he tooke vppon him, that
the whole Bible, or such parcels as he doth
admit for holie Scripture, or reiect, ar in
deede, or ar not holy Scripture. He cannot
doe it; but by Tradition, and by the Ca-
tholique Church her authoritie.

The 2. is. No Catholique conferring,
must seeke to proue our opinions, which
the Sectaries disallowe of; for we ar in pos-
session, and defendants, not plainetifes.

The 3. is. The Catholique must not in
any case permit the Sectarie to bring anie
prooffe whatsoeuer, other then the *onlie*
vvritten vvord of Scripture, and this also,

without anie interpretation, glose, or consequence of his owne braine.

The 4. is Let not the Catholique suffer his Aduersary to leape from pale to pearch, and from one Controuerſie to another, vntill he be conuincd of errour in his beleefe, and this by the *onlie vwritten vword*.

The 5. is. The Sectarie not proouing by the *onlie vwritten vword*, that which he promised, as not able to performe it; the Catholique must conſtraine ether him, or ſome els there preſent, to ſubſcribe that he could not prooue what he vndertooke, in ſuch ſort, as he ought to haue donne.

The 6. and laſt is. The Catholique muſt conſer, and conſider with attention the places of Scripture, alledged by Sectaries to diſproue our doctrine; for ordinarily they make no more to the purpoſe, then apeare to a nut. For example to prooue *that vve muſt beleue the onlie vwritten vword*: they bring forth theſe places. Deuter 4. v. 2. Deuter. 12. v. 32. Galat. 1. v. 8. Apocalip. 22. v. 18. which make nothing againſt vs, or for them. For by the firſt and ſecond, we ſhould, according to the ſenſe of our aduerſaries, beleue nought els, but that which is in the Deuteronomie; by the third, nothing but that epiſtle of S. Paul; by the laſt, nought els but the Apocalipſe. See theire madnes, and foolery, and looke to theire water.

THE
LOVE OF
THE SOVLE.

Made by G. M.

B. J. Cat 17134

*Edmund College
Ware*

The only other copy is at
Whereunto are annexed certaine Catholike Questions to the Protestants.

WITH A NEW ADDITION
of a Catalogue of the names of Popes
and other Professors of the ancient Catho-
like Faith: and a Challenge to Prote-
stants to shew (if they can) a like
Catalogue of the names of the Pro-
fessors of the Protestant
Faith.

(3)
Printed with licence.
1619.